



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2020

by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3250080

6 Carlina Gardens, Woodford Green IG8 0BP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Stella Selwood against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4801/19, dated 20 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is alterations to front gable to create ensuite, two rear roof dormers, new windows to side wall, alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to front gable to create ensuite, two rear roof dormers, new windows to side wall, alterations to fenestration at 6 Carlina Gardens, Woodford Green IG8 0BP, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 4801/19, dated 20 December 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 032B-VA-100, 032B-VA-210 Rev 01, 032B-VA-310 Rev 01 and 032B-VA-400.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, including roof tiles and masonry on the rear elevation.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of Woodford Green Conservation Area (CA).

Preliminary Matters

3. I note that there is a difference between the description in the application form and that used by the Council in its decision notice. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the description shown in the Council's decision notice, as that is an accurate description of the proposed development as a whole.

4. Within the Planning Officer's Delegated Report, increasing the height of the gable-ended projection and adding two dormers, to the rear; and the front porch canopy, were considered acceptable and in keeping with the character and appearance of both the host property and the CA. Following my site visit, I concur with the view of the Council. As such, my main focus is the proposed increase in height of the gable-ended front projection, its cladding with clay tiles, and enlarging the existing window opening.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a large detached dwellinghouse at the end of Carlina Gardens, a cul-de-sac within a pleasant setting attributable, in part, to the presence of numerous trees protected by Order. Properties in Carlina Gardens have a similarity in design, in particular gable-ended projections below ridge height, and a consistent use of finishing materials.
6. The rear elevation of the host property is almost as prominent as the front, owing to orientation to the street. Views of both elevations are partially obscured by boundary fencing, hedges and trees. The raised ridge heights of both front and rear gable-ended projections will be the same and not above the ridge of the host property. The front gable-ended projection will not be widened or deepened. This taken together with: lifting the eaves height slightly and widening the upper floor window opening, to align with that below, does not result in an incongruous form of development as the characteristic ridge height is maintained.
7. Clay tiling is already in use on the dormers on the front elevation and is not uncommon in the surrounding streets. Therefore, the use of this material on the front and side elevations of the gable-ended on the upper floor, a level dominated by dark roof tiles, is acceptable.
8. The cul-de-sac is in a part of the CA where development is low density, gardens are mature with trees and shrubbery, a semi-rural character. The general appearance, overall height and footprint of the host property will remain unchanged, leaving garden space and trees unaffected thus causing no harm.
9. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is of considerable weight and importance. This is reflected in the NPPF at paragraph 193 which states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of the degree of harm. Having regard to the above, I conclude the proposal would preserve the character or appearance of Woodford Green CA.
10. Therefore, the proposal complies with policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). Among other things, these require a high standard of design that respects local context, including heritage assets, and maintains or improves the appearance of the locality or street scene. Similarly, creating high quality buildings and places is fundamental to sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Other Matters

11. In addition to design (including height) and trees, dealt with above, neighbours have raised other matters including: privacy and possible multiple occupation.

12. Privacy is maintained as the drawings show obscure glazing on upper floor gable windows and there is no reason to suspect that multiple occupation would occur on completion of development. Therefore, these concerns do not justify withholding permission.

Conditions

13. I have considered the need for conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the NPPF and the Planning Practise Guidance. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing dwelling, including rooftiles and masonry on the rear elevation, to protect the character and appearance of Woodford Green Conservation Area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR